

ICUN 102 RCE

Response to Final Official Action of February 23, 2005 in
Patent Application No. US/465,306
Page 13 of 18

III. REMARKS

Claim Objections

Claim 18 has been objected to because of improper format of the preamble. According to Examiner's suggestion, the phrase "in at least one server interfacing with at least one client" has been inserted in section (a) of the body of the claim 18. It is believed the objection has been overcome.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges that claims 30-40 have been allowed. However, claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

Examiner's Position:

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner holds the method steps as confusing between the computer implemented methodology and the steps taken by the trading company.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. §112, second paragraph, as incomplete by omitting essential steps. Claim 1 allegedly fails to recite any relationship of determining the cash finance component to the TC receiving securities from the CSC step c) and the TC receiving at least a portion of the cash/cash-credit blend from the CSC.

CT01/11OFFHA/215579.1

ICON 102 RCE

*Response in Final Official Action of February 23, 2005 in
Patent Application No. 09/465,506
Page 16 of 18*

Claims 18-29 are also rejected under 35 U. S. C. 112, second paragraph, as incomplete by omitting essential structural cooperative relationships.

Applicant's response:

Applicant has amended the descriptive language of rejected base claim 1 in new Claim 41 replacing rejected claim 1 which has been cancelled without prejudice. The amended language of the newly added base Claim 41 is believed to overcome the vagueness rejection under the 112 statute. The Claims 2-17 dependent from claim 41 have also been amended in compliance with the Examiner's suggestions.

As stated above, newly added Claim 41 is deemed to overcome also the alleged grounds for the incompleteness rejection of Claims 1-5. As Claims 2-5 are dependent from new claim 41, they are now also deemed conformant with the statute.

Finally, Claim 18 has been amended following the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, Claims 18 and consequently dependent Claims 19-29 are deemed conformant with the statute. Claims 21-24 and 28 have also been amended to the processor activity of 'processing and/or storing'.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 101

Examiner's Position:

CTOL/HOFFMAN/215579.1

ICON 102 RCE

*Response to Final Official Action of February 23, 2005 in
Patent Application No. 09/463,306
Page 17 of 18*

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory matter since they are allegedly not within the technical arts.

Applicant's Response:

Applicant disagrees. In view of the replacement of Claim 1 by amended Claim 41 as well as the amended Claim 6, Applicant believes that the computer implemented program is clearly represented in the body of the base Claims 41 and 6. Moreover, the steps of dependent claims 2, and 10-12 have been also amended in reference to the proper processor activity.

DRAWINGS

Applicant encloses 16 sheets of formal new drawings pertaining to Figs 1-16 pursuant to the Examiner's request of February 23, 2005 re Application Papers (line 10) of the Action Summary.

ICON 102 RCE


*Response to Final Official Action of February 23, 2005 in
Patent Application No. US/465,506
Page 18 of 18*

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully asserts that the amended claims are now in condition for allowance.

Applicant hereby requests early acceptance of the application as presently amended.

Dated: June 22, 2005


Hans Peter G. Hoffmann, Reg. No.
37,352 Agent for Applicant
KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP
Stamford Plaza Two
281 Tessler Boulevard
Stamford, CT 06901
Telephone (203) 351-8011
e-mail: hhoffmann@kelleydrye.com

CT01/11OFFH/215579.1